

**Craney Island Eastward Expansion**  
**Preliminary Footprint Review Meeting**  
August 15, 2000

1. Introductions
2. Discuss Corps Team Review of Preliminary Footprints
3. Virginia Pilot Association Review of Preliminary Footprints
4. New Footprints
  - a. Design of Channels
  - b. Requirements of Virginia Pilots
    - i. Channel Setback?
    - ii. Turning Basins?
    - iii. Buoys?
5. Closing Discussion, Review of Action Items

## **Craney Island Eastward Expansion Preliminary Footprint Review Meeting**

August 15, 2000

Attendees:	Bill Cofer	Virginia Pilot Association
	John Stuart	Moffatt and Nichol Engineers
	Mike Knott	Moffatt and Nichol Engineers, Norfolk Office
	Michelle Banton	USACE, Norfolk District
	Rich Winterfield	USACE, Norfolk District

The purpose of the meeting was to insure that the preliminary footprints being considered in the feasibility study were logistically feasible for the maneuvering vessels in and out of the proposed port facilities.

Mr. Bill Cofer began explaining the difficulties the pilots have been experiencing when trying to dock at the NIT North Terminal. To dock, the pilots must turn the vessel perpendicular in the channel and then back the vessel in, fighting strong currents. They have contacted the U.S. Coast Guard in regards to moving the buoy. He indicated that shaving off the shoal and rounding off the turn may help.

Footprint 1: Discussion began on Footprint 1 which depicted an Eastward Expansion with a channel set-back of 500'. Ms. Michelle Banton indicated a concern on how the vessels would approach the port and turn. Mr. Bill Cofer indicated that the approach would be simple. Mr. Knott indicated that the first increment would be a 3000' wharf or the equivalent of two berths. Additionally, the first increment of the Port would be adjacent to the portion of the Norfolk Harbor that narrows from 1000' to 800' with the East toe bordered by a shallow shoal. To determine the pilots needs for maneuvering the vessels, Ms. Banton inquired if the vessels would have enough room to turn a vessel and if turning in the channel would create a problem. Mr. Cofer indicated that the pilots are turning the vessels in the channel now. He explained further that the pilots could use the entrance channel area of the NIT South Terminal for extra turning room if required. However, he was open to a turning basin across from the proposed port facility. His major concern was of the surge effect of passing vessels on vessels that were moored alongside the port. He inquired as to how the channel setback was determined. Mr. Mike Knott referred to a study conducted by the Port of Houston, on the effects of passing vessels on moor lines. They determined that 135' was sufficient safe distance between a passing vessel and a vessel that was moored to a port. Ms. Banton inquired if the vessel class they used in their study and if the conditions were similar to those within the Norfolk Harbor. Mr. Cofer indicated that a good example of the effect of passing vehicles is evident where the oil tankers tie up in Portsmouth. Mr. Knott indicated that the first channel setback generated took into consideration the findings of the study and for safety reasons, doubled the distance. He indicated that they did feel like 135' was too narrow a distance since the booms of the cranes would stick out 200'. The cranes used on the proposed port would be of the same size as the new cranes at NIT. The discussion

also included as to whether the entire area indicated on the drawing would need to be dredged. Mr. Cofer assured that it would need to be dredged.

One question raised during the Corps Team Meeting was whether the Rail/Transportation Corridor would be built first, while the port would be built in increments. Mr. Knott indicated that it would have to be built first. This would allow for the connection to the third crossing and also prepare for the future expansion of the port.

Footprint 2: Ms. Banton mentioned that Footprint 1 did not preclude Footprint 2 from occurring. Mr. Cofer wondered the possibility of Footprint 2 as it would seem realistic that the port would utilize a portion of the eastern edge of Craney Island where the “good”, larger grain material was located. The proposed northward expansion depicted could serve as “mitigation” for the portion of Craney Island lost to the port.

Footprint 2 shows the Hampton Roads Crossing Study Alternative #9 shifted to accommodate the northern expansion of Craney Island. Ms. Banton inquired as to whether VDOT has seen these preliminary footprints and are aware of the possible effect they may have on their project. Mr. Knott and Mr. John Stuart indicated that they have not been directly contacted. Moffatt and Nichols has contacted Michael Baker, Inc. (contractor, hired by VDOT, to review 3<sup>rd</sup> Crossing) to retrieve information. Mark Mansfield is creating an Advisory Board of Key stakeholders to meet and review various aspects of the project. It is believed that VDOT would have a key person on that board. Ms. Banton inquired if it was thought to be beneficial to set-up a meeting with VDOT to show them the preliminary footprints and get their feedback prior to the meeting. It was agreed that this was a good idea. Ms. Banton indicated that she would set-up the meeting to be held at the district prior to the Advisory Board Meeting. During which, the preliminary footprints would be presented to VDOT for review, including the westward expansion footprints.

#### Summary:

- Mr. Bill Cofer appeared comfortable with 500’ setback for eastward expansion.
  - Would like to see results of navigation simulation
  - Concerned with movement of vessels along dock
  - Believed that the only viable expansion alternative was an eastward expansion. He agreed with a westward expansion of Craney Island for dredged material placement. Additionally, he envisioned a marina being built near the southwest corner of Craney Island.

#### Action items:

- \* Arrange meeting with VDOT to review footprint options.